



Mueller, B., Pinfold, D. M., & Woelfel, U. (2016). Cradle and Crucible of "Vergangenheitsbewältigung": Representations of the War Child in the Occupation Period (1945-1949). An Introduction. *German Life and Letters*, 69(4), 417-436. <https://doi.org/10.1111/glal.12128>

Peer reviewed version

License (if available):
CC BY-NC

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1111/glal.12128](https://doi.org/10.1111/glal.12128)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Wiley at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/glal.12128/abstract>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

CRADLE AND CRUCIBLE OF 'VERGANGENHEITSBEWÄLTIGUNG':
REPRESENTATIONS OF THE WAR CHILD IN THE OCCUPATION PERIOD (1945-49).
AN INTRODUCTION¹

BEATE MÜLLER, DEBBIE PINFOLD, UTE WÖLFEL

WAR CHILD AND 'WENDE'-CHILD

The war child has a rhetorical power that stands in direct inverse proportion to its perceived vulnerability. Whether it appears in the form of innocent 'collateral damage' or the ostensibly unchildlike 'child soldier', there is no more powerful image for mobilising international efforts on behalf of war-torn communities. Yet the traditional western perception of childhood innocence and vulnerability that underpins the viewer's response to images of war children also implies the natural symbolic potential of the child, specifically as the not-yet and therefore future adult, which holds out the hope of fresh beginnings. This intrinsic potential has made children susceptible to being instrumentalised by governments of all persuasions to represent a specific, and of course always brighter, future.

The Leeds University project 'Agents of Future Promise' has recently investigated this idea with reference to post-war France and Britain, demonstrating the extent to which French and British governments put children at the heart of their political discourse in the 1940s.² In Britain at least, this focus on childhood in the immediate post-war period cut across traditional political divisions to provide a rallying cry for a better future for all.³ But the situation was different in occupied Germany. Here, even children had been implicated in a now discredited regime, so while their capacity to suggest new beginnings was not entirely lost, it was certainly compromised. Moreover, given the ideological differences between the

occupying forces and their impact on wider public debates, the envisaged brighter future could not take the form of a single coherent vision for the German nation.

This volume is concerned not with the more top-down instrumentalisation of war children in political discourse, but rather with the various ways in which such children appear in the German cultural imaginary during the occupation period, and how these cultural representations anticipate and set the tone for much later debates about the German past. Some of the representations of wartime childhood discussed in this volume challenged traditional perceptions of innocent and vulnerable childhood to the extent that they had to wait for the different social and pedagogical climate of the 1980s before they re-emerged. It was not until the 1990s, however, that the war child emerged as a touchstone for conceptualising post-Cold War German and indeed European identities,⁴ a process in which this figure became the discursive centre of historical and psychological research as well as of broader public debates.

Michael Heinlein diagnoses an almost obsessive preoccupation with war childhood in German popular culture and public memory since the 'Wende'.⁵ This phenomenon is attributable to both global and local factors: on the one hand, our 'era of the witness'⁶ feels an increasingly urgent desire to record the last eyewitness testimonies of World War II, and indeed, to ensure that the mosaic of diverse individual narratives that constitute the full spectrum of war experience is recorded and preserved for posterity. More locally, the renewed interest in war childhood post-1990 derives from united Germany's need to reengage with its shared past and to consider what, if any, common ground there might be between two states with radically different historiographies of National Socialism. One answer to this question appears to have been provided precisely by what has been conceptualised as the founding generation, the 'Kriegskinder', whose ability to cope with

trials and deprivation and work hard without complaint can be interpreted as a legacy from their National Socialist childhood that proved paradoxically fruitful in the post-war years.

The surviving members of this 'Erlebnisgeneration' – those who experienced World War II as children – are the last 'authentic' link to this period, which was not only the crucible where national identities for the immediate post-war era were forged, but also laid the foundations for later developments. Nicholas Stargardt implies an awareness of the powerful symbolic potential of children in this respect as he describes the way new national identities were encouraged in Poland, Israel and West Germany in the 1950s, when 'innocent suffering often provided the raw material for morally uplifting parables of renewal'.⁷ But the war children would go on to provide more than mere raw material in the post-1990 era. Historical distance from the events between 1939 and 1945 turned the former 'Augenzeugen' into 'Zeitzeugen', i.e. into people who lived through the relevant period but can now reflect on it retrospectively. Martin Sabrow speaks of a 'Zeitzeugenkonjunktur' which saw the 'Zeitzeuge', a figure who is always defined by his or her victim status, rise 'zur eigentlichen Leitfigur des öffentlichen Geschichtsdiskurses nicht nur in Deutschland, sondern in der westlichen Welt überhaupt'.⁸ One of the more controversial aspects of post-1990 German memory culture has been the allegedly taboo-breaking focus on Germans as victims of war,⁹ a popular exculpatory image which contrasts sharply with less welcome narratives that cast Germans as Hitler's 'willing executioners' or shatter the comfortable myth of the 'unbescholtene Wehrmacht', as in the Hamburg *Wehrmachtsausstellung*.¹⁰ In this context of German victimhood, 'innocent children' loomed particularly large. Public interest in the topic of wartime suffering, which became particularly evident in 2002 with the massive debates surrounding the publication of both Günter Grass's novella *Im Krebsgang* and Jörg Friedrich's *Der Brand*, coincided with the period in the war children's lives when – following their retirement – they were most likely to have time to reflect on and record their

experiences; the result was a flood of individual autobiographical writings, anthologies, television documentaries, and docu-dramas.¹¹ But as Heinlein points out, the war children are not merely subjects of their own memories, but also objects of remembering: he refers to a simultaneous 'Selbst-' and '*Fremderfindung einer Generation*', where the term 'generation' allows the war children to appear as a more or less homogenous group and so makes it easier to instrumentalise them as a cultural or political collective in public discourse.¹² The very title of Sabine Bode's bestselling *Die vergessene Generation: Die Kriegskinder brechen ihr Schweigen* (2004), demonstrates how neatly war children's allegedly repressed experiences fitted into the prevailing discourse of German victimhood, while also providing a welcome reservoir for national re-conceptualisations. Thus Bode claims that understanding this generation's experience is crucial not just for the individuals concerned, but 'für die Identität und die Zukunft der Deutschen als Europäer'.¹³

In public debates, particularly in the mass media, the symbolic power of the war child derives from its uncontested victimhood; as Stargardt maintains, '[i]n all wars, children are victims. The Second World War differed only in the unprecedented extent to which this was true.'¹⁴ Similarly, for Martin Parsons 'one thing that can be said for certain is that whatever the circumstance, the child is the innocent and invisible victim [of war].'¹⁵ This emphasis on the war child's victim status did not, however, prevent historians from exploring in a more differentiated manner the differences between and consequences of the experiences of minors in war, depending on their national, confessional and ethnic identity, their gender, social background, familial situation and political convictions; in public discourse on the other hand the figure of the war child was reduced to a one-dimensional image of innocence that contributed to a positive self-portrayal of the new national collective's roots in times of drastic change, and to new international roles for the nation after unification.¹⁶

The post-‘Wende’ surge of interest both in the empirical experiences of war children and in exploiting the symbolic potential of the war child directly echoes aspects of the immediate post-war period, when the situation of children on the war-devastated continent was one of the top priorities for aid organisations, politicians, and educators;¹⁷ at the same time, the figure of the war child allowed a symbolic negotiation of the catastrophe in literature, film, and the media. Early post-war discourses about youth were, however, much more ambivalent than the post-1990 insistence on innocent victimhood. Jaimey Fisher has shown how, in the context of political re-education instigated by the Allies, discourses about the young, that generation corrupted by Nazism, were functionalised by adult Germans to negotiate highly complex issues such as guilt and responsibility, victimhood and perpetration, but also cultural and national identity in the wake of the utter disorientation that followed surrender:

Youth and education thus became crucial building blocks in postwar German national identity, which had to reconstitute itself on the ruins of tainted cultural categories. In fact, coming to terms with the past via the discourse about youth and education simultaneously helped select and emphasize elements of German culture around which national identity could be constituted in the future.¹⁸

The all-pervasive presence of the war child as representational figure during the occupation years has so far been largely overlooked by scholarship, yet this figure has fed into memory and identity discourses up to the present. In the turbulent years between 1945 and 1949 traditional notions of childhood provided an established framework for working out the emotional, political, ideological, and spiritual crises afflicting Germany and Germans. The adult population had to come to terms not only with the shock of military defeat and the

images that were emerging from liberated concentration camps, but also with the degree to which it had invested, politically and emotionally, in the regime that had visited such horrors on the world. The humiliation of occupation and the denazification processes imposed by the occupying forces to some extent externalised individual crises of confidence, as ordinary Germans were forced to confront the extent of their wilful blindness to or active support for an utterly discredited regime, and to ask themselves whether they could trust their own judgement in future. Just as the defeat had been total, so the crisis which enveloped the population included political, ideological, intellectual, moral, emotional and spiritual aspects, in what we term an all-enveloping crisis of consciousness. The child figure, with its natural symbolic connotations of innocence and new beginnings, yet also its concomitant susceptibility to corruption, apparently provided an ideal means of addressing this fundamental crisis, for it was functionalised for negotiating issues that went well beyond youth concerns, notably witnessing, guilt, and the possibility of redemption and reconciliation. The significance of the war child in these thematic contexts will be outlined briefly in the remainder of the introduction and explored in greater detail in the individual essays. But in order fully to understand the roles and functions assigned to the figure of the war child in the post-war German cultural imaginary and the part this figure played in setting the agendas for the post-war order we need first to consider traditional images of childhood in the German cultural sphere.

TRADITIONAL IMAGES OF THE CHILD

Dieter Richter identifies two fundamental, complementary images of the child that emerged from the increasing distance between children and adults in the modern era: the ‘aufgeklärtes’ and the ‘romantisches Kindheitsbild’.¹⁹ The first derives from an ethnographic perception of children from the educated adult perspective as ‘kleine Wilde’; this child becomes the focus

of the pedagogical efforts of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and its completed education and adult status exemplify the triumph of civilisation over nature. The second forms the inverse model of childhood, for precisely the child's unsocialised quality allows it also to function as a symbol of all that is original, pure and unspoiled, indeed as an embodiment of nature.²⁰ Richter sums up the fundamental difference between the two conceptions thus: 'Ist das Kind in der pädagogischen Bewegung Chiffre des *Noch-nicht-Menschen*, so im romantischen Verständnis Chiffre des *besseren Menschen*.'²¹

Richter's analysis suggests a degree of diversity in the understanding and representation of childhood in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and this diversity is conceded even by scholars such as Hans-Heino Ewers, who focuses on the more idealising and utopian images of childhood during this period.²² Nevertheless, the idealisation of childhood was a significant phenomenon in the Romantic era: it was underpinned by a broad western European understanding of childhood innocence derived from the Christian tradition and particularly images of the Christ child, which create the potential for any literary child figure to be not merely an innocent, but a redemptive figure. In the German tradition of childhood, this moral innocence and redemptive potential are complemented by what we might describe as an aesthetic innocence, referred to by Schiller in his treatise *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung* (1795/6) as 'das Naïve', 'eine *Kindlichkeit, wo sie nicht mehr erwartet wird*','²³ this explains to a large extent the privileging of childhood, the childlike, and the child's vision which peaked at this time. Under the dual influences of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's educational treatise *Emile* (1762) and Schiller's work, Romantic writers presented the child as close to nature and correspondingly unsullied by contact with society; it was therefore able to offer a fresh vision which lay at the heart of all artistry, and had redemptive potential.²⁴

Such powerful cultural roots render the myth of the child's innocence, its status as the 'besserer Mensch', remarkably resilient, even in the face of increased psychological understanding of the nature of childhood gained from the twentieth century, and the way the child has been implicated in the realities of the adult world through everything from political indoctrination to sexually explicit advertising. Writers in particular have continued to exploit this powerful myth of pre-lapsarian innocence and redemptive potential: as Richter points out, the redemptive child figure survives even into the literature of our own secular age.²⁵ But as post-1990 debates about the war child demonstrate, the notion of the child's inviolable 'innocence' also has a remarkably tenacious grip on public discourse, albeit in the watered down form of the innocent (by which is usually meant helpless and passive) victim.

What Nora Maguire terms the 'peculiar robustness of the myth of innocence' is nowhere more evident than in the way that myth has persisted in German writing about the Third Reich from the 1950s into our own century.²⁶ This persistence is at least in part due to a desire for the unsocialised perspective associated with childhood innocence, which Richter describes as having socio-critical potential;²⁷ in this context it enables a defamiliarising gaze on the Third Reich, and thus deconstruction and critique. Paradoxically, this is even the case when the child narrator or focaliser has been so completely indoctrinated by the Third Reich as to use its language and rehearse its value system quite unselfconsciously, for the perverted conception of normality this reveals activates the reader, encouraging them to substitute their own values for those presented in the text.²⁸

Literary authors from Günter Grass onwards make use of the myth of childhood innocence in the context of the Third Reich in a self-conscious, indeed in Grass's case, savagely playful manner, in order to provoke fresh engagement with a regime that was already being allowed to fade into the background of public discourse by the time *Die Blechtrommel* was published in 1959.²⁹ For those attempting to negotiate the crises of the war

and defeat in their immediate aftermath, however, there were more immediate and pressing questions at stake, and the multivalent and powerful symbolic potential of the child figure offered a range of different means of working through the crises according to different ideological persuasion. Nazi ideology had privileged the young as the standard bearers of the new era, and this had created a stark generational divide: according to Hitler himself 'Die Jugend hat ihren Staat für sich; sie steht dem Erwachsenen in einer gewissen geschlossenen Solidarität gegenüber'.³⁰ In this context it is hardly surprising that the myths of childhood Richter identifies should have emerged in full force in the immediate post-war years as a means once again of bridging the gap between adults and children, as well as providing future hope in a bleak situation. Richter's unsocialised 'wildes Kind' mutates into the image of the feral child, who is no longer under the control of the Nazis, but continues to live as (s)he has been socialised by them; such an image of childhood enables the displacement of blame for the war onto the feral youth, but as in Richter's 'aufgeklärtes Kindheitsbild', still allows for the possibility of that feral youth being civilised by right-minded adults and thus creating a fresh start. On the other hand, the 'romantisches Kindheitsbild' asserts the possibility of innocence, not merely as a passive quality associated with victimhood as in the post-1990 debates that seek to exculpate a generation, if not a nation, but as an active, redemptive quality that also implies the possibility of new beginnings in the present. But while both images of childhood offer the possibility of a fresh start, neither does so by obscuring what has gone before: the image of the feral child presupposes innocence previously corrupted, while the aesthetic innocence associated with the 'romantisches Kindheitsbild' provides for the possibility of a fresh, clear perspective on the past. Ultimately, the child figure represents much-needed continuity across a painful historical caesura: continuity between the war and its immediate aftermath, but also much broader cultural continuities. It is these continuities that make the child figure so attractive to those negotiating the crises of 1945.

THE WAR CHILD AS AUTHENTIC WITNESS:

'KINDERMUND TUT WAHRHEIT KUND'

After the war, a host of divergent wartime experiences and perspectives emerged, ranging from voices of those who had been persecuted by the Hitler regime to those caught up in the maelstrom of warfare and its aftermath, to those who played active or even leading roles in Nazi Germany, a tiny number of whom stood trial at Nuremberg. The corresponding tripartite categorisation into victims, bystanders, and perpetrators, as coined by Raul Hilberg³¹ and repeated manifold elsewhere, falsely implies distinctness, stability, and clarity of roles under Hitler. But the confusing cacophony of voices of 'Zeitgenossen', heard then and now, defies such simple classification; what those voices and their reception history show is the significance attributed to witnessing from a position of truthfulness and authority so as to provide an authentic narrative. The recent proliferation of such narratives points to what one might call a cult(ure) of authenticity: we ascribe more value to a narrative grounded in lived experience than to a fictional reworking of similar material. The war child plays a key role in this context, because a child's recollections are deemed authentic, not owing to the factual reliability of that child's individual narrative, but primarily owing to assumptions made about childhood itself as a period when the human being is closest to its origins. Childhood thus becomes the guarantor of authenticity, which in turn lends credibility to the war child's narrative.

Authentic, credible narratives were much desired in the climate of scepticism prevailing in the post-war period, especially in occupied Germany. This need is reflected in a new phenomenon: the emergence of the child as a witness of history. This process started with efforts to collect accounts not only from adult, but also from child victims of the war,

e.g. from Polish children deported to the USSR in the first two years of the war,³² and from Jewish children persecuted during the Hitler regime.³³ These children's narratives usually took the form of either school compositions or of testimonies based on interviews. What is particularly interesting here is that the children's recollections were incorporated into official records. Thus, the Central Jewish Historical Commission (CJHC) in Warsaw, while asking child survivors different questions from those put to their adult counterparts, did not formally distinguish child from adult testimonies in their archive, and numerous early post-war child Holocaust testimonies were published at the time (albeit mostly outside of Germany),³⁴ indicating that there was public interest in these stories and that considerable credence was given to them.

The importance assigned to the child as 'authentic witness' is particularly evident in the context of the Holocaust, because Holocaust genres are regarded as both grounded in history and striving toward historiography and historical authenticity.³⁵ 'When we read about the Holocaust', Barbara Foley comments, 'we do not want to read lies or evasions'.³⁶ The perception of testimonial writing as a genre that promises to combine the moral obligation to truth-telling with the personal account of the eyewitness-as-victim has contributed to the current popularity of memoirs by 'Zeitzeugen', and not only of those by authors from a Jewish background. Significant cultural capital is to be gained from speaking with the authority of the survivor, and this category has expanded over time to encompass an ever wider range of social groups who were adversely affected by the war, e.g. women, expellees, 'Ostarbeiter', homosexuals – and of course children. Paradoxically, what is traditionally associated with passive suffering in the past – the role of the victim – becomes the source of agency in the present, for the subject position of the war victim is one of great moral authority that brings with it the power to persuade or to convince. To some extent, the reverence accorded to 'Zeitzeugen' is due to the ability of latter-day ageing survivors to

speaking with a double moral authority based on the coexistence, in one person, of the remembering adult looking back on their lives from today's vantage point, and their remembered younger selves whose youth was blighted by war and persecution. If this subject position is assumed without justification it can cause outrage, because the expectation of authenticity has been violated, the 'autobiographical pact'³⁷ broken. This became evident during the infamous Wilkomirski case: initially hailed as a harrowing childhood memoir, *Bruchstücke* (1995) was soon unmasked as fictitious, its author Bruno Dösseker (né Grosjean), came to be regarded as psychologically disturbed or even as a fraudster, and widespread indignation ensued.³⁸

The desire for authenticity is not only the result of a need to acquire authoritative information from the horse's mouth; it is also intimately connected with an ultimately ethical impulse toward self-fulfilment. As Charles Taylor has explained, it is the very individualism of our time that poses a moral imperative to find one's own path through life, as otherwise, one would somehow miss the point of one's own existence; the belief in individual originality that needs to be discovered morally obligates people to strive for the true, the authentic self.³⁹ If the pursuit of authenticity has the status of an ethical value, the child's subject position in wartime narratives becomes doubly attractive: it promises an immediate route towards and an ethically grounded quest for truth and true selfhood.

The war child as 'Geschichtszeuge' thus provides a framework for engaging with a troubled and troublesome past that is comparable to the role Michael Rothberg assigns to Holocaust memory in his discussion of 'multi-directional' (as opposed to 'competitive') memory: 'far from blocking other historical memories from view in a competitive struggle for recognition, the emergence of Holocaust memory on a global scale has contributed to the articulation of other histories'.⁴⁰ Where war children themselves speak in tales told truthfully, or where the figure of the war child is represented by others, the opportunity arises for

expanding the engagement with the Nazi past well beyond the safe haven of the innocent child witness.

THE WAR CHILD AS A MEANS OF NEGOTIATING GUILT

Historians have long since challenged the popular notion of children's status as merely passive victims of World War II, stressing instead children's multiple active contributions not only to the running of the family but to the war effort itself, as well as to the post-war order; these contributions included taking over parents' responsibilities, trading on the black market, 'organising' provisions and negotiating with the 'enemy' as intermediaries.⁴¹ Nevertheless, the position of the victim became attractive in popular discourse because its assumed passivity and associated lack of responsibility had a highly exculpatory function: it is only the subject position of the free agent that brings with it accountability. In his timely philosophical discussion of individual and collective responsibility for the war and the Holocaust, *Die Schuldfrage* (1946), Karl Jaspers pointed out that whilst criminal culpability rested only on those individuals who had demonstrably committed crimes, political guilt affected the German collective, and every individual needed to search their own conscience for the extent of their moral and metaphysical guilt.⁴² Jaspers here obligates the individual by stressing that as an action is carried out by an individual, the actor comes under moral judgement.⁴³ Yet, as Jaspers concedes, 'Ohnmacht entschuldigt'.⁴⁴

In the immediate post-war context, however, the figure of the war child was not automatically associated with 'Ohnmacht' even where it was seen as innocent, and nor indeed was the innocent child the only role available within the prevalent discourses. Rather, the figure of the war child, often irrespective of whether it is presented as 'innocent' or 'feral', was endowed with considerable agency, a phenomenon which complicates traditional notions of childhood. The blurring of roles during the war and the immediate post-war period as

children acted in the place of adults, while adults were variously demoted to the status of minors, for example through the re-education programme, is reflected in children's self-perception. They frequently did not see themselves as passive or 'ohnmächtig': as the title quotation 'Ich schlug meiner Mutter die brennenden Funken ab' from the volume of Berlin post-war school essays illustrates, children, at times, presented themselves in the position of active subjects, carrying out crucial deeds.⁴⁵ Particularly in Stargardt's compilation, children's tendency to see themselves in the position of the agent even in the most overwhelming situations is documented, for example, in the story of the boy who writes in his diary about how he saved his mother and other women in the neighbourhood from being raped.⁴⁶

This self-image of children is also reflected in the discourses of the immediate post-war period, when it was taken up together with its counterpart, the 'ohnmächtige' adult. In his analysis of narrative fiction about the war, Manfred Karnick notes that such texts

erzählen von Menschen, denen befohlen wurde oder befohlen wird, nicht von den Kommandierenden. Sie erzählen von unten, nicht aus dem Standpunkt strategischer, politischer, gesellschaftlicher Übersicht. Sie setzen Kollektivbedingungen voraus, die den Spielraum des Verhaltens minimalisieren. Der einzelne ist Soldat oder Kriegsgefangener oder entlassener Kriegsgefangener oder, in äußerster Fremdbestimmtheit, rassistisch Verfolgter oder, im weitesten Rahmen, den Gefahren, Zerstörungen, Nöten der Kriegssituation Unterworfener in jeder dieser Beziehungen wie Borcherts Heimkehrer Beckmann 'einer von denen'.⁴⁷

The presentation of the adult as 'subordinate' was facilitated by the fact that Hitler had invested the German youth with such responsibility for the nation's future. Consequently,

where children appear as agents in the fiction of the immediate post-war period they are often morally ambivalent figures, even where their relative youth is adduced in mitigation.⁴⁸

Jaimey Fisher demonstrates to what extent adult complicity and guilt were thus projected unto the figure of the active youth. Whether shown as indoctrinated and fervent Nazi devotee or as homeless outlaw and savvy black marketeer, the figure of the war child exemplified the past dictatorship as a regime that had instrumentalised minors and set them against the adult world. On the other hand, even where the war child is imagined as innocent in the post-war discourses, it is not necessarily passive as well. In the Soviet Occupied zone, childhood innocence was often depicted on screen as a very powerful status potent with agency; here the fact that the young bear no responsibility for the Nazi dictatorship and the unprecedented atrocities it carried out was represented as an inviolable state of innocence which was the precondition for solving the post-war crises and initiating a new order. The general amnesty given to the German youth by the new Communist rulers and the Soviet administration⁴⁹ is thus reflected in the nature of children's activities, which are presented as the model for a new post-war productivity. The war child as agent, whether innocent or feral, is thus a highly symbolic figure in the post-war period and serves the purposes of exonerating the adult world and envisioning a new beginning.

THE WAR CHILD AS A MEANS OF REDEMPTION AND RECONCILIATION

The figure of the war child and the socio-political and discursive functions it was allocated differ early on between the Soviet Occupied zone and the western zones of occupation, and thus reflect the diverging ideals of the two emerging German states. This also reflects the more general significance of the war child as a site of national reconstruction within the emerging Cold War context. 'Children were central objects of population politics, nation building projects, and new forms of humanitarian intervention in the twentieth century, as

they represented the biological and political future of national communities.’⁵⁰ They were thus a central focus of the increasingly nationalist and politically divisive struggles after the war. Particularly the so-called ‘lost children’, who had been left without family, home and country, were seen as a vital resource for the various national reconstructions, which meant that their recovery and repatriation became a European competition over labour power and future citizens.⁵¹ As these reconstruction endeavours were accompanied by debates on ‘notions of home and homeland’⁵² the figure of the war child generated screen fantasies of reunion and reconciliation in domestic, national, but also broader ideological contexts. While the reinstatement of the family as the basis of the nation remained a popular motif in German films, particularly those made in the western zones of occupation, the war child’s national reintegration acquired explicitly ideological meaning in some East German and Soviet productions, which already envisaged the new home for the war children as socialist.

Such attempts to monopolise the war child for specific national, political or ideological purposes do not so much counter as affirm the fact that ‘the category of the child was (and remains) deceptively universal.’⁵³ Particularly the appeal of the iconic child victim in popular culture is grounded, as Mark Anderson suspects, in an inscription of the child into a universal, existentialist story we can easily identify with, a universalism which comes at the expense of the victim’s historical, ethnic, and political specificity.⁵⁴ Just as its universalism explains the nationalist and ideological appropriation of the figure of the war child by opposing sides, it also explains how this figure at the same time facilitated the crossing of national boundaries and former enemy lines at the political level as well as in the cultural imaginary. One such crossing was Victor Gollancz’s journey to Germany in 1946, which he undertook in order to document the destitution of the Germans in the British zone and thus raise both public awareness of the problem and money to alleviate it in Great Britain itself. As a British Jew Gollancz was attempting to mobilise support for those who, until recently,

had been his enemies in a double sense, a feat which he accomplished by focusing his attentions on two non-national categories, the 'working class' and the 'child'.⁵⁵ The enormous potential of the war child as a figure of international reconciliation becomes even more palpable in Walter Robert Corti's appeal from 1944 to build 'Ein Dorf für die leidenden Kinder', which initiated the Children's Villages all over the world. Corti links his idea of a peaceful 'Großverband der Menschheit' in an epoch of 'Weltfrieden'⁵⁶ to the figure of the war child and its needs. The rescue and reintegration of children across enemy lines would not only prefigure the new order in a 'Völkerbund der Kinder'⁵⁷, but would also allow the adult world to recover its own sense, which should be

[e]her geneigt unsere Kultur dem Kind anzupassen als das Kind unserer Kultur. [...] Ein kranker Schnitt liegt zwischen der Welt der Erwachsenen und der Welt des Kindes. Wenn das Himmelreich in uns liegt, dann werden wir es nur finden, wenn wir aus Lehrern des Kindes seine Schüler werden. Nicht daß die Kinder die Welt regieren, nicht daß sie die Autorität zu Hause übernehmen sollen. Aber daß wir ihre große Lebendigkeit in uns selber bewahren und aus dieser unsere Welt wirken.⁵⁸

Corti's vision draws on Christ's teaching about the importance of the childlike mentality: the need to become childlike, indeed to be 'born again' in order to attain the kingdom of heaven.⁵⁹ Just as God Himself became a child in order to redeem humanity, an image which underpins the Romantic conception of the redemptive child, so human beings are urged to rediscover the childlike in themselves, a quest which has the potential to transcend national boundaries.

This dream of international reconciliation in the 'name of the child' is evoked also in the images of reunion of the 'family of man'⁶⁰ after the great catastrophe of World War II and

the Holocaust, as evident in Edward Steichen's legendary post-war exhibition of the same title. Bringing together photographs from all over the world and across all lines of enmity to demonstrate the essence of humanity, the last section of the exhibition and the accompanying volume is dedicated exclusively to children of the world. On six pages there are 35 images of children from the US, Java, Japan, Switzerland, Morocco, Germany, the USSR, France, Italy and England, most of whom are depicted at play. While five of the pages contain five or more photographs each, the last page tellingly shows only one image: two toddlers, a boy and a girl, holding hands and walking down a small wooded path. The caption to this photograph stresses the children's role as the embodiment of future generations, 'A world to be born under your footsteps ... (St. John Perse)',⁶¹ an invocation of the child figure as the essence of 'universal man'.

The war child is thus ideally suited to addressing, and indeed bridging the gap between, national and international ethical concerns following the war. On the one hand, the child as witness of history can be read in a context-specific way, acting almost as an emblem of specific historical events, for example in the famous photo of the boy from the Warsaw ghetto.⁶² The boy's raised arms exemplify not only the brutal liquidation of that particular ghetto, but Nazi persecution of the helpless and innocent in general, and thus also express a wider accusation that enables engagement with guilt and responsibility for such crimes against humanity. On the other hand, the emblematic wronged child becomes a child in need, regardless of national background, and this turning away from historical specifics holds out the prospect of redemption if a helping hand is extended toward the child. Where the needs of the child as such are foregrounded, the adults' duty of care can take precedence, thus restoring agency to the older generation by pointing them toward transnational, parental roles. If adults take on responsibility for the young, then perhaps an acceptance of, or at least

engagement with, political, moral, metaphysical or even criminal responsibility for their roles during the Hitler years becomes a possibility as well.

The articles in this volume reflect not only the intense preoccupation with the war child in the German cultural imaginary of the occupation period, but also the range of different forms that engagement with this figure took. They include discussions of school essays, films, literary texts for both adult and youth readership, and photography, and they range beyond Germany to encompass reflections from Swiss exile, Austria, and Great Britain. Chronologically they also extend well beyond the immediate post-war period as the contributors assess how far constructions of the war child in the occupation years either set discursive trends which have continued to be influential up to the present day, or alternatively, were ignored at the time of production, only to re-emerge into more receptive social or pedagogical climates in the 1980s and beyond.

Alexandra Lloyd and Beate Müller both analyse early attempts to exploit the child's function as authentic witness by considering essays about the war and its aftermath written in 1946 by schoolchildren in Prenzlauer Berg and Nuremberg respectively. As Lloyd and Müller demonstrate, these essays articulate very directly the crisis of consciousness afflicting the German population as a whole, while also reflecting the very different ideological approaches and post-war agendas of the occupying forces in the two zones. Crucially, however, neither of the extensive collections of essays analysed in these two pieces was published in the immediate post-war years: a selection of the Nuremberg essays first appeared in 1980, a selection of the Prenzlauer Berg essays only in 1996. These delays do not merely suggest an initial reluctance to address the topic of the war in the public sphere: they also demonstrate that the children's essays to some extent anticipated and set the agenda for

much later debates. Müller's analysis of unpublished essays held in the Nuremberg municipal archives clearly demonstrates that these essays contain many of the key discursive tenets of later 'Vergangenheitsbewältigung', and it is not surprising that a selection of them was first published in a 'Lesebuch gegen den Krieg' at a time when Cold War tensions made a new, nuclear, war seem a real possibility.⁶³ In the case of the Prenzlauer Berg essays on the other hand, the delayed publication seems in part to derive from a post-war unwillingness to countenance any image of childhood that conflicted with the preferred construction of children as exclusively innocent victims. As Lloyd demonstrates, the publication of these essays fifty years after they were first written, and their subsequent repurposing in a comic strip by Ulli Lust in 2003, were both consistent with the post-'Wende' rediscovery of the 'Kriegskinder' generation. And yet they also challenge the basic tenor of that rediscovery, which was one of victimhood; the essays restored the agency of the 'Kriegskinder' at precisely the point when the assumed victimhood of this generation was being instrumentalised as a metonym for broader German wartime suffering.

While Lloyd and Müller both discuss what appear to be the most obvious examples of the war child as subject, speaking in its own voice, their analyses of the school essay as genre and the conditions of its production also demonstrate the impossibility of ever capturing that unadulterated voice. This impossibility of accessing the real (war) child is the key theme of Jessica Medhurst's contribution on Victor Gollancz's text *In Darkest Germany* (1947), where Gollancz presented the desperate material need suffered by Germans in the British zone largely through his photographs of what passed for children's shoes in Germany at this time. Here the child is not the subject, but rather the object of an adult gaze: Gollancz constructed the children as victims of both the war and the occupation policy that followed in order to persuade an apathetic British public to donate to the Save Europe Now campaign. Medhurst considers both *In Darkest Germany* and previously unpublished photographs to provide a

close analysis of Gollancz's textual and photographic strategies. She is thus able to reveal an acute sense of the insufficiency of both language and photography to capture the 'real' child which paradoxically underlie Gollancz's work. Medhurst develops an understanding of childhood and the child victim as constructions which may be generated around particular social or political purposes, but are never as simply pure and authentic as the Romantic construction of childhood might have us believe.

This understanding of universal childhood innocence to some extent informs another text where the German war child is constructed from the outside, in this case from Swiss exile, Lisa Tetzner's youth novel *Ist Paul schuldig?* (1945). Debbie Pinfold's analysis of this novel focuses on Tetzner's presentation of the adolescent Paul, which hovers between the assumed innocence of childhood and the assumed guilt of adulthood. Pinfold too is interested in the relationship between textual and pictorial material, analysing in particular the tension between textual evocations of an innocent child figure and illustrations that suggest an adult who is complicit with the Nazi regime, in order to argue that the novel uses childhood precisely as a means of negotiating ideas of guilt and responsibility. Pinfold's analysis demonstrates that the novel anticipates later debates about both German guilt and German wartime suffering; like the material discussed by Lloyd and Müller, this novel too had the potential to feed into much longer term debates, but would have to wait for a different social and pedagogical climate in order to enjoy a wider reception in the German cultural sphere.

The tension between childhood and adolescence that is key to Tetzner's novel also emerges as a central theme in Ute Wölfel's discussion of 'Trümmerfilme'. Wölfel's analysis of films from different zones of occupation shows that while child characters were routinely used to negotiate the post-war crisis of consciousness, there were nonetheless differences between the treatment of this figure in the Soviet and the western zones, which provide an early indication of the ideological agendas of the post-war Germanies. In films made in the

Soviet zone the (guilty) parental generation is elided in favour of child figures, whose innocence is presented not as the passivity of the victims, but rather as an active quality that helps to articulate a new national ideal based on collective, public productivity. In the films from the western zones, however, the focus is on adolescents who are presented as the inheritors of the Third Reich and therefore as feral and dangerous: the resulting re-emergence of parental authority and the nuclear family as a means of domesticating the young in these films suggests a restorative agenda for the emerging Federal Republic. Wölfel's analysis thus stresses the war child's function as an ideological but also as a relational figure, whose political qualities derive from its variable positions in a generational hierarchy.

Anastasia Kostetskaya's article broadens the view of the child figure in 'Trümmerfilme' by comparing Gerhard Lamprecht's *Irgendwo in Berlin* (DEFA, 1946) with Alexandr Fainzimmer's *U nikh est' rodina* (1949). Kostetskaya's focus is on the German concept of 'Heimat' and its Russian counterpart 'rodina', which she interprets as being realised by the respective film's restoration of family and nation as achieved through the re-integration of war children. While Fainzimmer employs the figure of the war child within an emerging Cold War context to invalidate the West and romanticise Stalinist Russia as true 'rodina', Kostetskaya argues that Lamprecht's earlier reconstruction of Berlin as the lost 'Heimat' through the figure of the war child is reworked in Fainzimmer's film and so included in an ideological framework which defined the homeland in political terms as socialist. Thus the article outlines cross-cultural continuities between the films, based on their reference to and the overlap between 'Heimat' and 'rodina', in order to show the political compatibility of the two terms; on this reading the Soviet film offers answers to the problems of the lost 'Heimat' posed by the German film, a mechanism illustrated by the way the power relations between father and child in Lamprecht's work are inverted in Fainzimmer's later piece. Unlike Wölfel's reading of the 'Trümmerfilme', which stresses

their grassroots democratic and pre-socialist vision of a new Germany, Kostetskaya focuses on aspects which lent themselves to a reinterpretation of the genre during the Stalinist socialism of the 1950s.

John Pizer's article also focuses on the emergence of a specific geographical space in his discussion of Ingeborg Bachmann's engagement with the war child. Pizer analyses an early story that has been relatively neglected by Bachmann scholarship, *Die Karawane und die Auferstehung* (1949), to argue that Bachmann was initially unable to articulate the trauma of her own youthful war experience except through the Wittgensteinian silence which pervades this text. He traces an arc from this story through the later *Jugend in einer österreichischen Stadt* (1959) and *Der Fall Franza* (1966) to suggest that Bachmann's portrayal of childhood evolved from an early tentative evocation of redemption through a dead young war orphan in a featureless desert landscape, through the depiction of the way Austrian youth was abandoned to its fate in the fascist period and its aftermath, to the ongoing manifestations of war trauma in *Franza*. He thus demonstrates the centrality of the war child to an understanding of one of Bachmann's main themes, namely the devastating consequences of an Austrian paternalism that manifested itself as fascistoid control over women and children into the 1960s.

From these various discussions the figure of the war child in the immediate post-war German cultural imaginary emerges as an over-determined figure who encapsulates a multitude of sometimes contradictory needs, fears, perceptions, and hopes. It serves to describe the experience of minors caught up in the war and the Holocaust and the perception of their suffering by adult helpers; it enables a compromised and conflicted adult world to articulate its fears and anger at the post-war situation, as well as its hopes for the future; it is functionalised as a representative of the old Nazi dictatorship as well as of the innocent generation to rebuild Germany; it is claimed by both ideological camps in the nascent Cold

War, yet also represents possibilities of universal redemption and international reconciliation. Just as it was the site of intense ideological struggles in the immediate post-war period, so it has been reshaped according to ongoing shifts in official and public discourse to remain a central focus of debates about the meaning of World War II. It offers an eternal point of departure for debates about a past of which we are the products but only the provisional endpoint.

1 This special issue is the result of a workshop on 'The War Child in the Occupation Period (1945 – 1949)' held at the University of Reading in July 2015, an event which was financially supported by a British Academy/Leverhulme Small Grant for a project on 'Children in German War (Con)Texts 1945 – 1949', which is hereby gratefully acknowledged. The authors would also like to thank the workshop participants, the contributors to this volume, and the editors of *German Life and Letters* for their enthusiasm for this project and their help in bringing it to fruition.

2 For details of this project, see <http://childrenofthefuture.leeds.ac.uk> (accessed 5 May 2016).

3 See Laura King's talk 'How were children mobilised to represent the future during the Second World War in Britain?', available at <http://childrenofthefuture.leeds.ac.uk/blog/> (accessed 5 May 2016).

4 For the European dimension of the phenomenon see Kjersti Ericsson and Eva Simonsen (eds.), *Children of World War II: The Hidden Enemy Legacy*, Oxford and New York 2005; Nicholas Stargardt, *Witnesses of War: Children's Lives under the Nazis*, London 2005;

Martin Parsons (ed.), *Children: The Invisible Victims of War*, Peterborough 2008; Martin Parsons, *War Child: Children Caught in Conflict*, Stroud 2008; Carsten Gansel and Pawel Zimniak (eds.), *Kriegskindheiten und Erinnerungsarbeit*, Berlin 2012.

5 Michael Heinlein, *Die Erfindung der Erinnerung: Deutsche Kriegskindheiten im Gedächtnis der Gegenwart*, Bielefeld 2014, p. 9.

6 Annette Wieviorka, *The Era of the Witness*, tr. Jarek Stark, New York 2006.

7 Stargardt, *Witnesses of War*, p. 8.

8 Martin Sabrow, 'Der Zeitzeuge als Wanderer zwischen zwei Welten', in Martin Sabrow and Norbert Frei (eds.), *Die Geburt des Zeitzeugen nach 1945*, Göttingen 2012, pp. 27 and 19.

9 For more detailed discussion, see amongst others, Bill Niven (ed), *Germans As Victims: Remembering the Past in Contemporary Germany*, Basingstoke 2006; Helmut Schmitz (ed.), *A Nation of Victims?: Representations of German Wartime Suffering from 1945 to the Present*, Amsterdam and New York, NY 2007; Stuart Taberner and Karina Berger (eds), *Germans as Victims in the Literary Fiction of the Berlin Republic*, Rochester, NY 2009.

10 Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*, New York, NY 1996. For more information on the exhibition, see <http://www.verbrechen-der-wehrmacht.de/docs/ausstellung/ausstellung.htm#> (accessed 6 January 2016).

11 See e.g. the following publications: Sabine Bode, *Die vergessene Generation: Die Kriegskinder brechen ihr Schweigen*, Stuttgart 2004; Margarete Dörr, 'Der Krieg hat uns geprägt': Wie Kinder den Zweiten Weltkrieg erlebten, 2 vols, Frankfurt and New York, NY 2007; Guido Knopp, *Hitlers Kinder*, Munich 2000; Hilke Lorenz, *Kriegskinder: Das Schicksal einer Generation*, Berlin 2005; also numerous books edited by Jürgen Kleindienst.

12 Heinlein, *Die Erfindung der Erinnerung*, pp. 42-5 (p. 45).

13 Bode, *Die vergessene Generation*, p. 29.

14 Stargardt, *Witnesses of War*, p. 7.

15 Parsons, *War Child*, p. 13.

16 For further discussion of the symbolic function of the child figure in the German unification process, see Alexandra Lloyd and Ute Wölfel (eds.), 'Childhood in German Film after 1989', *Oxford German Studies* 44.3, 2015.

17 Tara Zahra, *The Lost Children: Reconstructing Europe's Families after World War II*, Cambridge MA and London 2011. UNESCO reports such as *The Book of Needs*, Paris 1947 (vol. I), and Paris 1949 (vol. II), or Thérèse Brosse, *War-Handicapped Children: Report on the European Situation*, Paris 1950, detail the catastrophic situation of children to be tackled by politicians and aid organisations.

18 Jaimey Fisher, *Disciplining Germany: Youth, Reeducation, and Reconstruction after the Second World War*, Detroit 2007, p. 63.

19 Dieter Richter, *Das fremde Kind: Zur Entstehung der Kindheitsbilder des bürgerlichen Zeitalters*, Frankfurt 1987, p. 27.

20 *Ibid.*, pp. 25-7.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 26.

22 Hans-Heino Ewers, *Kindheit als poetische Daseinsform: Studien zur Entstehung der romantischen Kindheitsutopie im 18. Jahrhundert: Herder, Jean Paul, Novalis und Tieck*, Munich 1989, p. 8. See also Annette Simonis, *Kindheit in Romanen um 1800*, Bielefeld 1993, pp. 265-7.

23 *Über naïve und sentimentalische Dichtung*, Friedrich Schiller, *Werke und Briefe*, ed. Otto Dann *et al.*, 12 vols, Frankfurt a.M. 1992, VIII, p. 713. Italics in original.

24 For a fuller overview of images of childhood in German literature prior to 1945, see Debbie Pinfold, *The Child's View of the Third Reich in German Literature: The Eye Among the Blind*, Oxford 2001, pp. 9-25.

25 Richter, *Das fremde Kind*, p. 27.

26 Nora Maguire, *Childness and the Writing of the German Past: Tropes of Childhood in Contemporary German Literature*, Oxford 2014, p. 7.

27 Richter, *Das fremde Kind*, p. 27.

28 On the use of child focalisers as a means of defamiliarising the Third Reich, see Pinfold, *The Child's View of the Third Reich*. Maguire, by contrast, interprets the persistence of the myth of innocence to its status as a patriarchal myth and suggests that childhood tropes may acts as a 'locus or even hiding place for problematic and questionable desires and yearnings in relation to the National Socialist past'. Maguire, *Childness*, p. 17.

29 See Pinfold, *The Child's View of the Third Reich*, pp. 147-58.

30 Adolf Hitler, quoted in Baldur von Schirach, *Die Hitler-Jugend: Idee und Gestalt*, Berlin 1934, p. 55.

31 Raul Hilberg, *Perpetrators, Victims, Bystanders: The Jewish Catastrophe, 1933-1945*, New York 1992.

32 Between July 1941, when Soviet-Polish diplomatic relations were resumed, and April 1943, several hundred thousand Polish deportees, among them thousands of children, were released from captivity. Soon afterwards, their testimonies were collected; these documents are held in the Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University. Of these testimonies, 120 school compositions were published in an English translation: *War Through Children's Eyes: The Soviet Occupation of Poland and the Deportations, 1939-1941*, eds. Irena Grudzińska-Gross and Jan Tomasz Gross, Stanford CA 1981.

33 Both Jewish individuals and Jewish organisations, most notably the Central Historical Commission (CHC) in Munich and the Central Jewish Historical Commission (CJHC), collected children's testimonies. The CHC's files are held by Yad Vashem in Jerusalem (record group M.1.E); the CJHC's collection is today housed in Warsaw's Jewish Historical

Institute (record group AŽIH 301). Each of these two repositories contain more than 400 child Holocaust testimonies. For translated selections, see e.g. *The Children Accuse*, eds. Maria Hochberg-Mariańska and Noe Grüss, London and Portland, OR 1996; *Kinder über den Holocaust: Frühe Zeugnisse 1944–1948*, ed. Feliks Tych et al., Berlin 2008. For an analysis of the child testimonies collected by the CJHC, see Beate Müller, 'Trauma, Historiography and Polyphony: Adult Voices in the CJHC's Early Postwar Child Holocaust Testimonies', *History and Memory* 24/2 (2012), 157-95.

34 See for instance *Kinder-Martyrologie*, ed. Noe Grüss, Buenos Aires 1947; *Dzieci Oskarżają*, eds. Maria Hochberg-Mariańska and Noe Grüss, Warsaw 1947; *Ehad me-ir ve-shna'im me-mishpakhah* [One of a city and two of a family], ed. Benjamin Tenenbaum, Merhavia 1947.

35 See Berel Lang, 'Holocaust Genres and the Turn to History', in *The Holocaust and the Text: Speaking the Unspeakable*, ed. Andrew Leak and George Paizis, Houndmills, London and New York 2000, 17-31. For the seminal discussion of authorial strategies in Holocaust narratives, see Barbara Foley, 'Fact, Fiction, Fascism: Testimony and Mimesis in Holocaust Narratives', *Comparative Literature* 34/4 (1982), 330-60.

36 Foley, 'Fact, Fiction, Fascism', 359.

37 According to Philippe Lejeune, the 'autobiographical pact' stipulates that in an autobiography, the author, the narrator, and the character talked about are identical. See *On Autobiography*, Minneapolis 1988 [1987], p. 12.

38 For more information on this case, see Daniel Ganzfried (ed.), *...alias Wilkomirski: Die Holocaust-Travestie: Enthüllung und Dokumentation eines literarischen Skandals*, Berlin 2002; Stefan Mächler, *Der Fall Wilkomirski*, Zurich 2000; tr. *The Wilkomirski Affair*, New York 2001.

39 Charles Taylor, *The Ethics of Authenticity*, Cambridge, MA and London 1991, p. 29.

40 Michael Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*, Stanford, CA 2009, p. 6.

41 Stargardt, *Witnesses of War*; Patricia Heberer, *Children During the Holocaust*, (Documenting Life and Destruction: Holocaust Sources in Context), Lanham, MD 2011.

42 Karl Jaspers, *Die Schuldfrage: Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Frage*, Zurich 1947 [1946].

43 *Ibid.*, p. 10.

44 *Ibid.*, p. 47.

45 ‘*Ich schlug meiner Mutter die brennenden Funken ab*’: *Berliner Schulaufsätze aus dem Jahr 1946*, ed. Prenzlauer Berg Museum des Kulturstadtes Berlin Prenzlauer Berg mit Unterstützung des Landesarchivs Berlin, selected and with an introduction by Annett Gröschner, Berlin 1996. See Alexandra Lloyd’s contribution to this volume for a discussion of this collection.

46 Stargardt, *Witnesses of War*, p. 323. This self-image of children also informs Wolfgang Borchert’s celebrated story ‘*Nachts schlafen die Ratten doch*’: while the protagonist may appear as an innocent and powerless victim of war to both the reader and to the man who tries to tempt him away from the rubble where his younger brother lies buried, the child himself has a clear sense of his own purpose and mission as he sits dutifully on guard. Wolfgang Borchert, *Das Gesamtwerk*, Hamburg 1996, p. 217.

47 Manfred Karnick, ‘Krieg und Nachkrieg: Erzählprosa im Westen’ in Wilfried Barner *et al.* (eds), *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von 1945 bis zur Gegenwart*, Munich 1994, pp. 31-75 (p. 58).

48 See for example Debbie Pinfold’s discussion of Lisa Tetzner’s *Ist Paul schuldig?* (1945) in this volume.

49 Michael Buddrus, ‘A Generation Twice Betrayed: Youth Policy in the Transition from the Third Reich to the Zone of Soviet Occupation (1945 – 1946)’, in Mark Roseman (ed.),

Generations in Conflict: Youth Revolt and Generational Formation in Germany 1770 – 1968, Cambridge 1995, pp. 247-268 (p. 255).

50 Zahra, *Lost Children*, p. 20

51 *Ibid.* See also the chapter "Displaced Children" in Mark Wyman, *DPs: Europe's Displaced Persons, 1945-1951*, Ithaca and London 1998, pp. 86-105.

52 Zahra, *Lost Children*, p. 21.

53 *Ibid.*, p. 9.

54 Mark M. Anderson, The Child Victim as Witness to the Holocaust. An American Story? *Jewish Social Studies* n.s. 14/I (2007), 1–22 (3).

55 For further discussion of Gollancz's report on this journey, *In Darkest Germany* (1947), see Jessica Medhurst's contribution to this volume.

56 Walter Robert Corti, 'Ein Dorf für die leidenden Kinder', *Du*, August 1944, pp. 50-52 (p.50) http://www.wrcorti.ch/pdf/du_8-44.pdf (accessed 12 January 2016).

57 *Ibid.*, p. 52.

58 *Ibid.*

59 See Matthew 18,3 and John 3,3.

60 Thus the title of the exhibition which Edward Steichen created for the Museum of Modern Art in New York. *The Family of Man*, New York 1955.

61 *Ibid.*, p. 192.

62 For a detailed discussion of this photograph and its afterlife, see Richard Raskin, *A Child at Gunpoint: A Case Study in the Life of a Photo*, Aarhus 2004.

63 Hannes Heer (ed), *Als ich 9 Jahre alt war, kam der Krieg: Ein Lesebuch gegen den Krieg* [1980], Reinbek 1983, p. 7.